

Independent Democrat.

TERMS, \$3,

"FREE TRADE; LOW DUTIES; NO DEBT; SEPARATION FROM BANKS; ECONOMY; RETRENCHMENT; AND STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION."

In Advance.

Volume I.

CANTON, MISSISSIPPI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1842.

Number 1.

The Independent Democrat, EDITED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, BY JOHN HANDY.

TERMS.—Three Dollars, invariably in
advance. Persons wishing to discontinue
it please give notice thereof in writing.
No subscription received for a less time
than six months.

Advertisements inserted at the rate of
five cents per square, (ten lines or less),
for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square
for each subsequent insertion.

Advertisements which are not limited on
manuscript, as to the number of inser-
tions, will be continued until ordered out,
and charged accordingly.

Articles of a personal nature, whenever
published, will be charged at the rate of
one dollar for every ten lines for each
insertion. Political circulars or public ad-
vertisements, for the benefit of individual per-
sons or companies, will be charged as ad-
vertisements, and at the same rates.

Announcing Candidates for office will
be charged each.

All Job Work must be paid for on deliv-
ery.

Postage on letters must be paid, or they
will not be attended to.

REMARKS OF MR. CALHOUN, Senator of the United States, August 27, 1842, on the passage of the Tariff Bill.

MR. CALHOUN said he felt it due to him-
self and those he represented, that he
should give his opinion on this bill, and
that he would do so as briefly as possi-
ble.

The hour was late, and the time
short, and he should be as brief as possi-
ble.

He would begin by premising that it
appeared a large portion of the party
were much embarrassed in de-
termining how they should vote on this
bill.

But, if he might be permitted to
say, he should say that, if they had
cause for mortification, (as they cer-
tainly had,) they had still greater cause
for exultation.

If one of their favorite mea-
sures was lost by its passage; another,
still greater and more important favor-
able to them, would become a law, if appear-
ances did not deceive.

For his part, he regarded
this bill (now, as he feared, on the eve
of passage) as a measure more thoroughly
protection, and less for revenue, than
any he had ever seen submitted for the
consideration of the Senate.

It is the
omission of the duty on tea and
coffee, which recently passed this body,
and the veto of the Executive.

He had already shown, in all things
connected with the most important ever intro-
duced into the Senate. What he now
wished to show, was that the burden
was more for protection, and less for
revenue, than any preceding measure, not
withstanding the one vetoed.

His examination of this bill will show
there is not an article manufactured in
this country, nor one which might come
in competition with one that is, which
is not subject to high protective duties.

The latter description may be placed
in two classes, the one, which, though not
manufactured in the country, are
subject to as high duties as those that are,
and the other, which are manufactured in
this country, and are subject to low duties.

He admitted duty free, or subject to a
light one. But this is not all. Most
of the articles for which the exports of
this country are exchanged are subject to
duties: such as wines, silks, woollen
goods, iron, hardware, &c.

These, then, of our political friends
who intend to vote for this bill, deceive
themselves, in supposing they are impos-
ing a provisional or temporary burden.

It is easy to put on the burden, but it
will prove hard to take it off—as we have
ample experience. The exigency under
which they, unfortunately, suppose they
are compelled to vote for it, will be as
great—nay, greater—against repealing or
reducing the duties it imposes, hereafter,
as it is now to impose them.

Instead of being less dependent, the operatives, who
live by the bodies of the grants, will be
more numerous, and more dependent; and,
if to refuse to impose these duties now,
would subject them to starvation, as we
are told,—to repeal or reduce them here-
after would more certainly be followed
(and that to a greater extent) by the same
effect.

He would tell those who were
about to take the fatal step, that they were
about to do some thing which could not be undone
without a death blow to the Constitution.

He would tell them, that the
proposed measure would bring
an empty treasury, and a conflict with
protection, or the great principle of intelli-
gence should teach them that the
whole scheme, with all its intricate
phrases, is but a device of the
manufacturers to live
on the products of their labor.

Such, at least, was his conception; and,
he believed he might say that of the many
friends around him, and who with him
were opposed to this bill. And what are the
motives which are held out to us to give
it our support? We are told by its friends
and advocates that its passage would set-
tle the question. They say the country

needs repose; and that its business and
prosperity cannot be revived till it is at-
tained. They may be admitted. But
will the passage of this bill settle the
question, and give repose? The very re-
verse. It will greatly increase the agita-
tion. The principles involved in the
controversy are so directly hostile, that
the question can never be settled till one
or the other shall permanently prevail.
There is (and, in the nature of things,
there can be) no compromise between
those who hold that the power of levying
duties was given only for the purpose of
raising revenue for the support of the
Government, and can constitutionally and
honestly be exercised only for that pur-
pose; and those who hold that, in laying
duties for the wants of the Government,
they may, at the same time, be laid for
the purpose of taking money from one
portion of the community, to give to an-
other. The great struggle between these
conflicting principles now is, which shall
gain the permanent ascendancy. This
bill, if it should pass, would, at least for
the present, give it to the side of mono-
poly, and against the side of equal rights;
and if that ascendancy should become per-
manent—if its passage should settle the
question, as its advocates fondly hope, in
vain will be our victories at this, and the
extra session for popular institutions.

The popular party, of which we are mem-
bers, must go down; and our opponents,
with their policy, and the form of govern-
ment to which it must necessarily lead,
will rise permanently in the ascendancy.
Justice and equality—justice rigidly en-
forced, and equality between citizen, State
and State, and one portion of the country
and another, are essential elements of our
system of government, and of the policy
to which we profess to belong; and no
system of policy can be admitted, which
shall permanently depart from them, with-
out fatal consequences to both. Already,
if we may judge from the declarations of
the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr.
Choate], and other advocates of this mea-
sure, the protective policy which this bill
carries, so far, has made fearful changes
for the worse in a large portion of the
population of our country. According to
their representations, the operatives en-
gaged in manufactures which have been
forced into existence by the system, de-
pend for their bread on the passage of this
bill. It is a measure of our dependence on
the movement of this Government consistent
with the bold and independent spirit of
freedom? Can a population be relied on
to watch over and control its movement,
or resist its encroachments, when whether
they shall live or starve depends on the
change of two or three votes in this or
the other House—and that, too, depending,
perhaps, on no higher consideration than
the calculation of political chances?—
That any portion of our population should
be in so low and dependent a condition,
excited his commiseration. If such are
the blessings of the system—if it can so
humble, in so short a time, the once proud,
hardy, and independent yeomanry of New
England,—he, for one, would infinitely
rather see the portion of the Union where
his lot is cast, impoverished by its exac-
tions, but still retaining its erect and in-
dependent spirit, than wallowing in all the
wealth it can bestow.

But our political friends who are about
(unfortunately, as he believed) to give this
bill their votes, endeavor to console us by
telling us it is a mere provisional measure,
intended to meet present exigencies; and
that it will be repealed, or greatly mod-
ified, in a short time after we get into pow-
er. They doubtless think so; but will it
be the case? Can they, on reflection,
seriously believe that the necessity, which
they plead in excuse for their votes, will
be less than it is now?

Do they really think that the manu-
facturers will be better able to bear a reduc-
tion of those high duties about to be im-
posed, as it is alleged, to save them, than
they are now to do without them? If they
do, they will be woefully mistaken. We
have had a good deal of experience on the
subject. The effect of high duties is not
to decrease the necessity of continuing them,
but the reverse—to increase the neces-
sity of raising them still higher. This
bill itself furnishes some striking evidence
of the fact. Among the articles on which it
imposes the highest rates of duty, is that
of coarse cottons—rates not less than
100 per cent. on some descriptions; and
they are the very articles so highly favor-
ed by the tariff of 1816, under the mini-
mum duty, which the Senator from Ken-
tucky [Mr. Crittenden] so kindly brought
to his recollection in the course of his re-
marks. We were then told (as we now
are of this bill) that it was a mere pro-
visional measure to protect an infant man-
ufacture, which, in a few years, would
protect itself by its own intrinsic energy,
and yet now, after more than a quarter of
a century, the manufacturers of the same
articles come and ask a still higher duty,
in proportion, than what they then did—
Again; another favored article, at that
time, was iron, which was then subject to
a duty of 33 per cent. to protect which
against the foreign, a duty of 33 per cent
was laid on the imported; and now, also,
its manufacturers come again, after so
great a lapse of time, and ask a duty of
25 per cent; which is an ad valorem duty
on the present cost greater than the rate
per cent. in 1816—being not less than
100 per cent. He would add another
item—that of cotton bagging and bale rope;
on which the rate per cent. is much higher,
as now proposed by this bill, than under
the tariffs of 1824 or 1828; although
we had the same assurance as to it, as we
have now as to this bill—that it was pro-
visional, and that the home market would
soon furnish a cheaper and better article.

In fact, the whole bill, taken in connexion
with the declarations of its advocates—that
the manufacturers must go down un-
less these duties are imposed—forms a
volume of evidence that the whole effects
of all passed protection, from 1816 to this
day, have been but to require still higher.
It is, indeed, in the nature of the system,
as he had proved when the vetoed bill was
before the Senate, that every duty impos-
ed had but the effect of requiring a still
higher. The cry ever has been more,
more, more. The more it has been sup-
ported, the more it required to be sup-
ported.

Those, then, of our political friends
who intend to vote for this bill, deceive
themselves, in supposing they are impos-
ing a provisional or temporary burden.

It is easy to put on the burden, but it
will prove hard to take it off—as we have
ample experience. The exigency under
which they, unfortunately, suppose they
are compelled to vote for it, will be as
great—nay, greater—against repealing or
reducing the duties it imposes, hereafter,
as it is now to impose them.

Instead of being less dependent, the operatives, who
live by the bodies of the grants, will be
more numerous, and more dependent; and,
if to refuse to impose these duties now,
would subject them to starvation, as we
are told,—to repeal or reduce them here-
after would more certainly be followed
(and that to a greater extent) by the same
effect.

He would tell those who were
about to take the fatal step, that they were
about to do some thing which could not be undone
without a death blow to the Constitution.

He would tell them, that the
proposed measure would bring
an empty treasury, and a conflict with
protection, or the great principle of intelli-
gence should teach them that the
whole scheme, with all its intricate
phrases, is but a device of the
manufacturers to live
on the products of their labor.

Such, at least, was his conception; and,
he believed he might say that of the many
friends around him, and who with him
were opposed to this bill. And what are the
motives which are held out to us to give
it our support? We are told by its friends
and advocates that its passage would set-
tle the question. They say the country

needs repose; and that its business and
prosperity cannot be revived till it is at-
tained. They may be admitted. But
will the passage of this bill settle the
question, and give repose? The very re-
verse. It will greatly increase the agita-
tion. The principles involved in the
controversy are so directly hostile, that
the question can never be settled till one
or the other shall permanently prevail.
There is (and, in the nature of things,
there can be) no compromise between
those who hold that the power of levying
duties was given only for the purpose of
raising revenue for the support of the
Government, and can constitutionally and
honestly be exercised only for that pur-
pose; and those who hold that, in laying
duties for the wants of the Government,
they may, at the same time, be laid for
the purpose of taking money from one
portion of the community, to give to an-
other. The great struggle between these
conflicting principles now is, which shall
gain the permanent ascendancy. This
bill, if it should pass, would, at least for
the present, give it to the side of mono-
poly, and against the side of equal rights;
and if that ascendancy should become per-
manent—if its passage should settle the
question, as its advocates fondly hope, in
vain will be our victories at this, and the
extra session for popular institutions.

The popular party, of which we are mem-
bers, must go down; and our opponents,
with their policy, and the form of govern-
ment to which it must necessarily lead,
will rise permanently in the ascendancy.
Justice and equality—justice rigidly en-
forced, and equality between citizen, State
and State, and one portion of the country
and another, are essential elements of our
system of government, and of the policy
to which we profess to belong; and no
system of policy can be admitted, which
shall permanently depart from them, with-
out fatal consequences to both. Already,
if we may judge from the declarations of
the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr.
Choate], and other advocates of this mea-
sure, the protective policy which this bill
carries, so far, has made fearful changes
for the worse in a large portion of the
population of our country. According to
their representations, the operatives en-
gaged in manufactures which have been
forced into existence by the system, de-
pend for their bread on the passage of this
bill. It is a measure of our dependence on
the movement of this Government consistent
with the bold and independent spirit of
freedom? Can a population be relied on
to watch over and control its movement,
or resist its encroachments, when whether
they shall live or starve depends on the
change of two or three votes in this or
the other House—and that, too, depending,
perhaps, on no higher consideration than
the calculation of political chances?—
That any portion of our population should
be in so low and dependent a condition,
excited his commiseration. If such are
the blessings of the system—if it can so
humble, in so short a time, the once proud,
hardy, and independent yeomanry of New
England,—he, for one, would infinitely
rather see the portion of the Union where
his lot is cast, impoverished by its exac-
tions, but still retaining its erect and in-
dependent spirit, than wallowing in all the
wealth it can bestow.

The portion of our party who have un-
fortunately separated from us on this mea-
sure rest their support on different grounds.
They plead, in the first place, the condi-
tion of the treasury as a justification of
their vote. That it is bad; that the de-
mands on it are urgent and great, and its
means of meeting them small; that the
public credit is prostrated; and that the
agent, who has been idly sent abroad to
negotiate the loan, has been treated with
disrespect, was, he apprehended, too true;
and to be lamented that it is true. But
who are responsible? He and the party
of which he is a member are not. We
had no agency in the measures which
have led to the present exhausted condi-
tion of the treasury. On the contrary,
we have done all in our power to resist it.
We saw the danger at the extra session;
and raised then, and have continued ever
since to raise, our warning voice against it.
We opposed the withdrawal from the
treasury of the revenue from the lands—
resisted the creation of the debt; we cal-
led on those in power to retrench and
economize in time; but all in vain. The
last thing they thought of was the ways
and means. It was the last at the extra
session, as it is now the last at this. He
stopped not to inquire whether this strange
course was the effect of negligence or de-
sign on the part of those in power—de-
signed to force this their favorite measure
of policy through; and whether our po-
litical friends, who intend to vote for it,
on the ground of the exigency of the treas-
ury, are not, without intending it, but
consummating that design.

But it may be said that we are bound
to relieve the treasury, without inquiring
into the fact, by whom, or in what man-
ner its embarrassment was caused. That
may be admitted; but surely, when we
come to the question of remedy, if there
be a difference of opinion, those who are
responsible, who have caused the mischief,
and not those who have waived against it,
and opposed the measures that led to it,

ought to yield. It is going too far on
their part, after they have done the mis-
chief, to refuse to remedy it, unless we
shall agree to join them in a measure as
bad, to say the least, as the disease.

But admit that something should be
done, and that speedily, to replenish the
treasury and revive public credit; and
that a full share of the responsibility is on
us; how does it happen that this imperi-
ous necessity should attach to this par-
ticular measure, and none other? Why
not vote for the measure moved by the
Senator from Virginia, to go back to the
compromise act as it stood in the year
1841, when six-tenths of the duty above
20 per cent. still remained to come off,
and which would afford a greater revenue
to the treasury, and protection by duties
varying from 20 to 40 per cent. to the
manufacturers? The objection, it seems,
to it, was, that it proposed to subject tea
and coffee to a moderate amount of duty,
and that only till the debt was paid.—
Without undertaking to deny or affirm
whether the objections to taxing those ar-
ticles are as great as has been alleged, he
would venture to say that there were many
considerations which make them peculiarly
fit subjects of revenue. In the first
place, duty imposed on them acted as a
bounty to no one. Whatever the people
might pay for consuming them, would go
exclusively into the treasury, and not into
the pockets of monopolists. In the next
place, they were objects of general use
over the whole country, and by every
class, which would make a duty on them
fall on all, according to the extent of their
consumption; and, finally, they are re-
ceived in exchange for great export, for
domestic manufactures, and a duty on
them would have the effect of throwing
some portion of the burden of supporting
the Government on that privileged inter-
est. And yet, with all these considera-
tions in their favor as fit subjects of taxa-
tion, it seems that the objection to any
measure including them is so great, that
this odious, unequal, unjust, oppressive,
anti-republican, and unconstitutional mea-
sure of our opponents, is to be preferred
to it, however unobjectionable the mea-
sure including them might be in other re-
spects.

But that is not the only measure pro-
posed as a remedy for the treasury. The
Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Choate],
proposed to subject all articles which are
imported, to a duty of 25 per cent. for
home value, and a duty of 10 per cent.
for foreign value, and then to subject
the same to a duty of 25 per cent. more
if it should be found that the treasury was
undisturbed. And yet, with all their pro-
fession of attachment to that act, on the
part of the political friends of the mover,
and all the anxiety felt for the state of the
treasury by the supporters of the bill, it
received a very feeble support.

Another, and the last, was moved as a
substitute by the Senator from Arkansas,
[Mr. Sevier], which proposed to impose a
duty of 25 per cent. on the foreign cost,
with the addition of 10 per cent. for the
home valuation, on all articles which paid
a duty, before 30th June last, above 20
per cent.—making the duty on them a-
bout equal to 27 1/2 per cent., and to leave
the duties at or below 20 per cent., as they
then stood; which would have yielded
more revenue than this bill, and afforded,
with the cash duties, a protection of about
33 per cent. on the protected articles.—
This, too, failed; and that, on an objec-
tion to one uniform average ad valorem
duty on all articles. There are certainly
strong objections, on revenue principles,
when the rate of duty is high, to such an
average duty; but, with a low rate, it has
many and great advantages; and, among
others, its simplicity and impartiality, and
the strong resistance it opposes to an in-
crease, by enlisting every interest against
it. But a conclusive answer will be found
to the objection in the fact, that the mea-
sure moved by the Senator from Arkansas
did not subject all articles to one uni-
form ad valorem duty, as is supposed.—
On the contrary, it provided for several
separate classes—one at 25, another at
20, and others below—which experience
would seem to favor, as a mode preferable
to all others imposing duties. But give
to the objection its greatest strength, and
how inconsiderable is it, compared to the
overwhelming objections to this bill.

Let Mr. Calhoun voted for each of
these measures—not that I was prepared
to adopt them, as they were moved; but
because I regarded them as intended for
revenue and not protection, and believed
them to be susceptible of being made the
basis of a bill calculated to meet the ex-
igencies of the treasury, and also of ex-
tricating the country from existing diffi-
culties, so far as it could be effected by the
fiscal action of the Government without
the sacrifice of principle; but the manner
they were received satisfied me that
there was no prospect of doing anything
which would accord with my views.

Another reason assigned for voting for
this bill was the distressed condition of
the manufacturers. Admitting it to be
true, to the extent alleged, he would ask
if the other business of the community
were less embarrassed; and if it is just,
equal, safe, constitutional, or consistent
with sound principles, to relieve them by
the sacrifice of the others?

Another, and a final reason remains to
be stated,—that it would suspend the dis-
tribution act. He acknowledged its force.
No one more strongly objected to that un-
constitutional and dangerous measure
than he did, or placed a higher estimate
on the importance of expunging it from
the statute book; but, as bad as the mea-
sure is, he was not prepared to say that it
was worse than this, or to get rid of it by
substituting it in its place. But suppose
them to be equally objectionable, there
was this difference between them: it
would be far easier to extricate ourselves
from that, than from this. There was no
comparison in the extent and the strength
of the interests that would be enlisted in
favor of this measure, compared with
those in favor of distribution; while, the
whole of our party are united and zealous
against that, the feebler measure, but un-
fortunately divided to a considerable ex-
tent, it would seem, in reference to this,
the stronger. According to his opinion,
the repeal of the distribution act by the
next Congress, with the whole weight of
our party and the Executive Department
against it, was as certain as almost any
future event; yet he was ready to make
considerable sacrifice for immediate rid-
dance from that odious measure, but noth-
ing like as great a voting for this bill.

No one could more sincerely deplore
that any portion of our political friends
should bring themselves to support a mea-
sure to which he was so strongly opposed,
and which he sincerely believed to be
directly hostile to the principles of the
Constitution, and our free and equal gov-
ernment, than he did. But they had come
to a wrong conclusion; but he did hope that
they would retain the strong repugnance
they express to a measure, which they
think themselves under circumstances
compelled to support, and will rally at an
early period, not only in co-operation with
the rest of the party, to free the country
from its blighting effects, but will take the
lead in its overthrow.

As chroniclers of the times, it is perhaps
proper that we should give place in our
columns to the subjoined protest of Presi-
dent Tyler. It is more eloquently and ably
written than any State paper that has ema-
nated from any source, and may be
regarded as a masterpiece of eloquence and
logic. It is a document which will be
read with interest and admiration by all
who are true to the principles of the Con-
stitution, and who are true to the rights
of the people.

But the paper is stripped of almost
all the influence it would otherwise have,
by the consideration that the proceeding,
on the President's part, is at war with his
previous conduct and votes in 1834, while
in the Senate of the United States, when
Gen. Jackson sent in his Protest to that
body. His vote is there recorded in favor
of the Resolutions then passed, declaring
the Protest of Gen. Jackson to be a breach
of the privileges of that House, and that
the President has no right to send a formal
Protest to the Senate against any of its
proceedings. This of course furnished Mr.
Botts with a fair chance to "head" the Cap-
tain, and he did so by offering and adopt-
ing the very resolutions for which Mr.
Tyler had voted in Gen. Jackson's case.
And thus as the Globe remarks, was the
poisoned chalice which Mr. Tyler had held
to the lips of the old hero, completely re-
turned to his own. The resolutions of Mr.
Botts were adopted by large majorities, ex-
cept the one which directed the Protest to
be carried back to the President.

PROTEST OF THE PRESIDENT.
To the House of Representatives:
By the Constitution of the United
States, it is provided, that "every bill
which shall have passed the House of Rep-
resentatives and the Senate, shall, before
it becomes a law, be presented to the
President of the United States; if he ap-
proves, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall
return it, with his objection, to that House
in which it shall have originated; who
shall enter the objections at large upon
the journal, and proceed to reconsider
it."

In strict compliance, with the positive
obligation thus imposed upon me by the
Constitution, not having been able to
bring myself to approve a bill which or-
iginated in the House of Representatives,
entitled "An act to provide revenue from
imposts, and to change and modify exist-
ing laws imposing duties on imposts, and
for other purposes," I returned the same
to the House, with my objections to its
becoming a law. These objections, which
had entirely satisfied my own mind of the
great impolicy, if not the unconstitution-
ality, of the measure, were presented in
the most respectful, and even deferential
terms. I would not have been so far from
forgetful of what was due from one depart-
ment of the Government to another, as to
leave intentionally employed, in my offi-
cial intercourse with the House, any lan-
guage that could be, in the slightest de-
gree, offensive to those to whom it was
addressed. If, in assigning my objections
to the bill, I had so far forgotten what was
due to the House of Representatives as to

impute its motives in passing the bill, I
should owe, not only that House, but to
the country, my most profound apology.—
Such departure from propriety is however,
not complained of, in any proceeding
which the House has adopted. It has, on
the contrary, been expressly made a sub-
ject of remark, and almost of complaint,
that the language in which my dissent was
couched was studiously guarded and cau-
tious.

Such being the character of the official
communication in question, I confess I
was wholly unprepared for the course
which has been pursued in regard to it.—
In the exercise of the power to regulate
its own proceedings, the House, for the
first time, it is believed, in the history of
the Government, thought proper to refer
the Message to a Select Committee of its
own body, for the purpose (as my respect
for the House have compelled me to in-
fer) of deliberately weighing the objec-
tions urged against the bill by the Execu-
tive, with a view to its own judgment upon
the question of the final adoption or rejection
of the measure.

Of the temper and feelings in relation
to myself of some of the members select-
ed for the performance of this duty, I have
nothing to say. That was a matter en-
tirely within the discretion of the House
of Representatives. But that Committee,
taking a different view of its duty from
that which should have supposed had led to
the selection, instead of confining itself to
the duties assigned it, has formally to ar-
raign the motives of the President for oth-
ers of his acts since his induction in office.
In the absence of all proof, and, as I am
bound to declare, against all law or prece-
dent in parliamentary proceedings, and at
the same time, in a manner which it would
be difficult to reconcile with the comity,
hitherto sacredly observed in the inter-
course between independent and co-ordi-
nate departments of the Government, it
has assumed my official conduct, without a
shadow of a pretext for such assault, and
stopping short of impeachment, has charged
me, nevertheless, with offences declared to
deserve impeachment. Had the extraordi-
nary report which the Committee thus
made to the House been permitted to re-
main without the sanction of the latter,
I should not have uttered a regret, or com-
plained of any course pursued by the House
in relation to the subject. But, when
it is made by any article of testimony
to support the charges it contains, with-
out a deliberate examination, almost with-
out any discussion, the House of Repre-
sentative has been pleased to adopt it as
its own, and, thereby, to become my ac-
cuser before the country, and before the
world. The high character of such an
accuser, the gravity of the charges which
have been made, and the judgment pro-
nounced against me, by the adoption of
the Report upon a distinct and separate
vote of the House, leave me no alternative
but to enter my solemn protest against
the proceeding, as unjust to myself as
a man, as an invasion of my constitutional
powers as Chief Magistrate of the Ameri-
can People, and as a violation, in my
person, of rights secured to every citizen
by the laws and the Constitution. That
Constitution has entrusted to the House of
Representatives the sole power of impeach-
ment. Such impeachment is required to
be tried before the most august tribunal
known to our institutions.

The Senate of the United States com-
posed of the Representatives of the so-
vereignty of the States, is converted into
a hall of justice, and in order to insure
the strictest observance of the rules of evi-
dence and legal procedure, the Chief
Justice of the United States, the highest
judicial functionary of the land, is re-
quired to preside over its deliberations. In
the presence of each judiciary the voice
of faction is presumed to be silent, and
the sentence of guilt or innocence is pro-
nounced under the most solemn sanctions
of religion, of honor, and of law. To
such a tribunal does Constitution author-
ize the House of Representatives to carry
up its accusations against any chief of the
Executive Department whom it may be-
lieve to be guilty of high crimes and mis-
demors. Before that tribunal the ac-
cused is confronted with his accusers, and
may demand the privilege, which the jus-
tice of the common law secures to the
humblest citizen, of a full, patient, and
impartial inquiry into the facts, upon the
testimony of witnesses, rigidly examined,
and deposing in the face of day. If such
a proceeding had been adopted toward me,
not only as I should certainly have re-
garded it, I should, I trust, have met with
a becoming constancy a trial as painful as
it would have been undeserved. I would
have manifested, by a profound submis-
sion to the laws of my country, my perfect
faith in her justice, and relying on the
purity of my motives, and the rectitude of
my conduct, should have looked forward
with confidence to a triumphant vindication
in the presence of that country, and by
the solemn judgment of such a tribunal,
not only of what charges might have been
formally preferred against me, but of all
the calumnies of which I have hitherto
been the unresisting victim. As it is, I
have been accused without evidence, and
condemned without a hearing. As far as
such proceedings can accomplish, I am

Another, and a final reason remains to
be stated,—that it would suspend the dis-
tribution act. He acknowledged its force.
No one more strongly objected to that un-
constitutional and dangerous measure
than he did, or placed a higher estimate
on the importance of expunging it from
the statute book; but, as bad as the mea-
sure is, he was not prepared to say that it
was worse than this, or to get rid of it by
substituting it in its place. But suppose
them to be equally objectionable, there
was this difference between them: it
would be far easier to extricate ourselves
from that, than from this. There was no
comparison in the extent and the strength
of the interests that would be enlisted in
favor of this measure, compared with
those in favor of distribution; while, the
whole of our party are united and zealous
against that, the feebler measure, but un-
fortunately divided to a considerable ex-
tent, it would seem, in reference to this,
the stronger. According to his opinion,
the repeal of the distribution act by the
next Congress, with the whole weight of
our party and the Executive Department
against it, was as certain as almost any
future event; yet he was ready to make
considerable sacrifice for immediate rid-
dance from that odious measure, but noth-
ing like as great a voting for this bill.

No one could more sincerely deplore
that any portion of our political friends
should bring themselves to support a mea-
sure to which he was so strongly opposed,
and which he sincerely believed to be
directly hostile to the principles of the
Constitution, and our free and equal gov-
ernment, than he did. But they had come
to a wrong conclusion; but he did hope that
they would retain the strong repugnance
they express to a measure, which they
think themselves under circumstances
compelled to support, and will rally at an
early period, not only in co-operation with
the rest of the party, to free the country
from its blighting effects, but will take the
lead in its overthrow.

As chroniclers of the times, it is perhaps
proper that we should give place in our
columns to the subjoined protest of Presi-
dent Tyler. It is more eloquently and ably
written than any State paper that has ema-
nated from any source, and may be
regarded as a masterpiece of eloquence and
logic. It is a document which will be
read with interest and admiration by all
who are true to the principles of the Con-
stitution, and who are true to the rights
of the people.

But the paper is stripped of almost
all the influence it would otherwise have,
by the consideration that the proceeding,
on the President's part, is at war with his
previous conduct and votes in 1834, while
in the Senate of the United States, when
Gen. Jackson sent in his Protest to that
body. His vote is there recorded in favor
of the Resolutions then passed, declaring
the Protest of Gen. Jackson to be a breach
of the privileges of that House, and that
the President has no right to send a formal
Protest to the Senate against any of its
proceedings. This of course furnished Mr.
Botts with a fair chance to "head" the Cap-
tain, and he did so by offering and adopt-
ing the very resolutions for which Mr.
Tyler had voted in Gen. Jackson's case.
And thus as the Globe remarks, was the
poisoned chalice which Mr. Tyler had held
to the lips of the old hero, completely re-
turned to his own. The resolutions of Mr.
Botts were adopted by large majorities, ex-
cept the one which directed